

Table 2 then provides comparisons between FAP α and other molecules. The conservation is clear. So too, is the fact that these are the three segments corresponding to highly conserved catalytic domains.

With this in mind, the examiner's comments at page 2 of the office action:

"The specification does not specifically identify or teach (e.g., by starting and ending residues or by identification as a separate sequence) which "sections of the FAP α protein are the catalytic domain and/or extracellular domain."

is categorically wrong.

Applicants argued previously that the catalytic domain are contained within amino acids 621-737 of FAP α . They stand by that statement, because the first catalytic domain begins at amino acid 621, and the third one ends at amino acid 737.

The examiner alleges that applicant "contradicts himself with his argument in the response of 7/17/01 that the structure required for catalytic activity is Gly-Trp-Ser-Tyr-Gly."

The examiner is requested to put the statement in context. What applicant said was the following:

"Ogata et al shows that Gly-Trp-Ser-Tyr-Gly is required for enzymatic activity in serine hydrolases. This is also required in the catalytic domain of FAP α ."

This is a correct statement, and it is not contradictory. Gly-Trp-Ser-Tyr-Gly is in fact, contained within amino acids 621-737, and applicants quoted Ogata correctly.

The examiner then goes on to misread the specification in making the rejection. Page 12 clearly and unequivocally discusses table 2 as showing "three segments corresponding to highly conserved catalytic domains characteristic of serine proteases." If there is any doubt about this, then the examiner should take the time to review the relevant act on the listed molecules. The specification of an application is presumed to satisfy the dictates of 35 USC §112. Rather than use the correct standard and to evaluate the specification accordingly, the examiner has set forth a rejection that cannot be sustained.

LUD 5330.3 DIV (09901357)

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 20-26 is proper and is urged.

Respectfully submitted,

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.

By: 

Norman D. Hanson

Reg. No. 30,946

666 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10103
Tel: (212) 318-3000
Fax: (212) 318-3400